

For the rest of us, there are other issues of equal moral heft that we ought to be considering before we move to the estate tax issue. I hope we get a chance to during the course of this session. It is important during the course of this budget debate that we talk about issues that mean something to families, small businesses, and family farmers across America.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield for one additional question?

Mr. DURBIN. I will yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I indicated to the Senator from Nevada that if there is to be a vote on the estate tax issue in the coming days—and I guess it may be with respect to the tax provisions dealing with the energy bill, I will want the opportunity to offer a second-degree amendment or at least offer essentially the same amendment we considered last year, and that amendment will draw a distinction. The distinction is this: If my amendment is adopted, then effective in 2003, no transfer or passage of any family business or family farm, regardless of size, to qualified heirs will have an estate tax obligation attached to it. None. It will be completely exempt next year.

There is nothing under the minority party's proposal that would immediately exempt family businesses from the estate tax. It will be another 7 years or so before they are totally exempt.

My amendment says, yes, let's exempt them, and do it immediately. My amendment also provides for a higher threshold exemption on all other estates. And I do not intend to agree to an unanimous consent agreement on this issue unless I have an opportunity to offer that as an amendment as well.

Warren Buffett has been here a couple of times in the last year or so to visit with us. He is the world's second richest man. He said to us: What can people be thinking about, getting rid of the estate tax? I do not support getting rid of the estate tax. This is the world's second richest man. He said you ought not do that; it does not make any sense.

Bill Gates' father came to Congress and said: Don't get rid of the estate tax completely. There are people who have billions of dollars who ought to pay some basic estate tax because they have never paid taxes on those assets, and that is the majority of those assets for the largest estates.

When they pass, obviously a significant part ought to go to their heirs, but a significant part ought to be available to invest back into this country's future, especially education, health care, and other critical areas.

I think the proper way to deal with this issue is to recognize there is merit to the question of whether we want to interrupt the transfer of a family business to other family members. The answer from us is, no, we should not interrupt that transfer. If mom and dad want to pass the business along to the kids to run, I do not care how big the

business, let's not saddle them with an estate tax obligation.

The fact is, the amendment I offered last year would have exempted all of them completely next year. We can do that. I would like an opportunity to vote on that again, if we are going to vote on exempting all estates forever from the estate tax. I think we ought to have a vote on the amendment I offered last year.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DR. RUDOLFO ANAYA'S NATIONAL MEDAL OF ARTS AWARD

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I speak briefly today to recognize one of my State's greatest citizens—an extraordinary author whose contributions to the arts have made him known as the father of modern Chicano literature. Today Dr. Rudolfo Anaya will be 1 of 14 distinguished artists to receive this year's National Medal of Arts.

Dr. Anaya is a legend in New Mexico and throughout the Nation for writings that reflect the cultural crossings unique to the Southwest. Born in the small town of Pastura, NM, he grew up in a Spanish-speaking home rich with tradition. His family moved to Albuquerque when he was 15, where he attended high school.

His first novel, "Bless Me, Ultima," was published in 1972 and won him the prestigious Premio Quinto Sol national award for Chicano literature. This widely-acclaimed novel brought many Hispanic traditions into the limelight, creating a colorful narrative spiced with Spanish vocabulary. "Bless Me, Ultima" continues to be a best-selling Chicano work, and is used in classrooms throughout the world as a standard text for Chicano studies and literature courses.

Dr. Anaya's work combines history and tradition with the supernatural. Old Spain and New Spain, Mexico, and Mesoamerica, all come together in a style that Newsweek has referred to as "the new American writing." his second novel, "Heart of Aztlan," explores a Mexican-American family's struggle with discrimination and poverty and its determination to preserve a proud sense of cultural identity. Such themes recognize a harsh reality, while also presenting the richness of Hispanic and Native American traditions and ceremonies that are so fundamental to New Mexican culture.

Other works by Dr. Anaya include "Zia Summer," "Rio Grande Fall," "Jalanta," "Torguga," "Anaya Reader," "Albuquerque," and his most recent mystery novel, "Shaman Winter." He has also written numerous short

stories, essays, and children's books, including "Farolitos for Abuelo" and "The Farolitos of Christmas." Other distinguished awards include the PEN Center West Award for Fiction, the Before Columbus American Book Award, and the Excellence in the Humanities Award.

Dr. Anaya is a professor emeritus of English at the University of New Mexico, where he began teaching in the summer of 1974. That same year he served on the board of Coordinating Council of Literary Magazines. Both Dr. Anaya's teaching and his work build an interest and pride in New Mexican history. His unique story-telling abilities stem from the oral tradition he experienced growing up, and his desire to pass these stories down to children make him an author, a storyteller, an educator, and a role model.

As our Nation continues to explore ways to better educate our children and increase cultural awareness, we must look to role models like Dr. Anaya for guidance. His writings continue to inspire people of all ages, from all ethnic backgrounds. He has not only brought a rich tradition of story-telling and folklore to bookshelves all over the world, but he has also utilized his tremendous gift to portray the Hispanic experience. He inspires young writers to share their gifts, and he provides given millions of readers, including myself, incredible joy.

The state of New Mexico is proud to be home to such an esteemed artist—one who has brought the Southwest to the forefront of American literature. I am truly honored to congratulate Dr. Anaya for all of his accomplishments for for the distinguished National Medal of Arts award that the President will present to him this afternoon in Constitution Hall. His hard work has earned him our utmost respect and admiration. I would like to thank him personally for his outstanding contributions to the arts in America.

THE ENERGY BILL

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will say a few words about where we find ourselves. I know we are in morning business, and that is appropriate for the various statements that have been made, but this is the beginning of week 6 in which the Senate is considering energy legislation. We are fast approaching a decisive point in that debate: Will we be able to bring this bill to an orderly close this week or will we not?

We tried before to get a finite list of amendments agreed to, and there were objections raised by some in the Senate so we were not able to do that. We also could not get any agreement, at least as yet, on tax provisions. So the majority leader has filed for cloture on the bill, and all first-degree amendments have now been submitted. That deadline was 1:30 today.

I hope we are able to deal with the remaining amendments and move forward. I hope we are able to invoke cloture so we can bring this very large

legislation to an orderly conclusion. Obviously, we want to see all issues that relate and that are germane to this energy bill adequately considered, but at this point, 5 weeks into the debate and starting week 6, I think most Senators have had ample opportunity to present their amendments and raise the issues they think are of concern.

I see there are other Senators seeking recognition. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FIX IS IN ON O'HARE AIRPORT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, in the upcoming discussion on the expansion of O'Hare, in which I know the Presiding Officer has been deeply involved, one of the issues the Senate will be debating will be a competitive bidding requirement for the contracts and concessions at O'Hare Airport. I intend to offer an amendment that would apply Federal competitive bidding procedures to the contracts at O'Hare and which would require the city of Chicago to disclose the recipients of those contracts.

The lead articles in the two major Chicago newspapers over the weekend illustrate precisely why this competitive bidding amendment is essential. The two papers, taken together, report a pattern of flagrant and chronic abuse in the city of Chicago. The Chicago Tribune reports that Mayor Daley's pals get rich yet again on a huge public works project that the city of Chicago thoroughly misrepresented. Simultaneously, the Chicago Sun-Times reports that, because of a budget crisis, city workers get the choice of unpaid days off or layoffs. That is the pattern: The connected guys get the bucks; the ordinary guys get the shaft.

Yesterday, the Tribune reported that a major Chicago deal was enacted with the aid of an intense public relations campaign that misled the citizens of the city and the State on a number of key issues. That deal—Soldier Field—followed a distinctly Chicago pattern. After the deal was rammed through, we find that misrepresentations were so egregious that it is difficult to call them misrepresentations and not outright fabrications. We also find that several political friends and allies of both the mayor and the Governor make serious money off their inside connections.

I will read from the Tribune. The title of the article is "Bears play, Public pays." It is by Andrew Martin, Liam Ford, and Laurie Cohen.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 21, 2002]

BEARS PLAY, PUBLIC PAYS

(By Andrew Martin, Liam Ford and Laurie Cohen)

As construction at Soldier Field advances, a Tribune analysis of the \$632 million project shows that the public bill for the stadium renovation is higher than city officials have said it would be while benefits to taxpayers—in terms of promised parkland and additional part revenues—fall short of what was promised.

The bottom line is that the new Chicago Bears stadium will get one of the largest government contributions in the history of professional sports, a fact obscured by a public-relations strategy that tried to divert attention from the public costs. Among the Tribune's findings

City officials have said the public bill for the project won't exceed \$406 million; in fact, another \$26 million in public costs is buried in bond documents. That money brings the total public tab to \$432 million.

While Mayor Richard Daley praised the Bears's \$200 million contribution to the project as "unheard of" for a publicly owned stadium, neither the mayor nor anyone else involved in the project noted that the city's contribution also might be unprecedented.

Officials with the Chicago Park District, which owns Soldier Field, have called the renovated stadium a good deal for the agency. But an internal Park District analysis shows the agency will make \$900,000 less the first full year the stadium is open, figures that officials now dispute. Meanwhile, the new stadium is expected to double the value of the Bears franchise, experts said.

Proponents of the stadium renovation pointed to the creation of 19 acres of parkland for Chicagoans. But officials counted landscaped medians and sloped berms beside a parking garage as part of the acreage, according to one of the project's architects, Dirk Lohan.

In reality, only about 10 acres of usable parkland is being created, according to an analysis by Friends of the Parks, which is suing to stop the renovation. The lawsuit could be decided at a hearing Thursday.

"You're not able to play on a slope or on the middle of a roadway," said Erma Tranter, the group's president.

The strategy to sell the Soldier Field renovations, mapped out in a 1990 memo by the Bears' public-relations firm, was based on emphasizing the new stadium's amenities, such as new parkland and expanded lakefront parking in an underground garage, while downplaying public costs for the Bears facility.

"The problem with the current debate is that it is too often about the Chicago Bears and not about the future of Chicago and its prized lakefront," according to the memo, crafted by the firm, Burson-Marsteller. The public-relations advisers recommended a strategy recommended a strategy that includes changing "the conversation from 'public funding for the Chicago Bears stadium needs' to a civic-led discussion" about such things as preserving Soldier Field as a landmark and "doing things right, the Chicago way," said the memo, a copy of which was obtained by the Tribune.

The Soldier Field deal contradicts previous public statements from the mayor and Gov. George Ryan, who had balked at government financing for the stadium.

It also ran counter to a trend in the NFL in which teams in lucrative markets such as the Washington Redskins and the New England Patriots are paying most of the costs for their privately owned stadiums, the Tribune analysis found.

Meanwhile, in nearly every city where government subsidies were used for a publicly

owned NFL stadium in the last decade, a referendum was held to ask voters whether they approved of the idea. In Chicago, the city went to court to stop a proposed referendum on the plan.

Daley on Saturday defended his support for the Soldier Field project, saying the \$200 million private contribution was unprecedented and the public portion was paid for by taxes on hotel rooms, not property taxes.

Had the city not proceeded with the stadium deal, the mayor said, "Soldier Field, what are you going to do with it?"

Daley appeared to confirm the Friends of the Parks allegation that the project would only create 10 acres of usable parkland, not 17. "They're building 10 acres of open space and another seven acres of landscape in all of that. That's what you need to make it environmentally friendly."

The city's longtime point man on the Soldier Field deal, Edward Bedore, a former city budget director who now is a lobbyist for the city, Park District Supt. David Doig and other Park District officials declined to be interviewed.

Bears Chief Executive Officer Ted Phillips and former Bears President Michael McCaskey declined to comment.

Barnaby Dinges, a public relations consultant for the project, said the Park District will save money in the long term by not paying the increasing costs of maintaining an old, deteriorating stadium.

"There are tremendous benefits to this project," Dinges said. "After 30 years of trying, the Park District, the Bears, the city and the state finally found a plan that does right by taxpayers, park and Museum Campus users, the lakefront, sports and entertainment fans and the people of Illinois."

In written responses to questions, Park District officials said that the Bears' contribution to the project far exceeds what most other teams have chipped in for stadiums. Park District officials also stood by their estimate for new parkland, which was revised from 19 acres to 17 acres after the deal passed the state legislature and more precise calculations were made.

"This figure includes the planted medians, which amount to just a fraction of an acre," the statement says.

Lohan, the architect, said, "A berm can have plants on it, and isn't that part of a park?"

A DEAL IS STRUCK

Although most of the principals would not comment, others familiar with the deal suggested that the decades-long logjam over a new Bears stadium was broken because of a confluence of several key points. There was a flash of inspiration by the Bears' architect about how to squeeze a new stadium into a historic landmark, an infusion of cash from the NFL and a change of leadership in the governor's office and the Bears' executive suites.

At the same time, the deal created a huge public-works project with plenty of hefty contracts for friends and political allies of City Hall and Springfield. For instance, the bond work went to former proteges of Bedore's, security for the construction site is provided by an alderman's brother's firm and the local partner for the construction team is a major Ryan contributor whose vice president was chairman of the governor's inaugural ball.

The Soldier Field project was sold to the public, in part, because of the \$200 million contribution by the Bears, which is the largest private contribution for a publicly owned NFL stadium. But the Bears are contributing only about \$30 million of their own money. The remainder comes from \$100 million from the NFL and the sale of personal seat licenses to season-ticket holders.